



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,065	02/20/2004	Daniel J. Magenheimer	200315952-1	2613

22879 7590 08/05/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KAWSAR, ABDULLAH AL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,065	Applicant(s) MAGENHEIMER, DANIEL J.	
	Examiner ABDULLAH AL KAWSAR	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-27,29-31,33 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-27,29-31,33 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-27, 29-31, 33, 35-43 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-27, 29-31, 33, 35, 37-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (Bennett) US Patent Publication No. 2004/011732.
3. As per claim 1, Bennett teaches the claimed invention as claimed including a computer system comprising:
 - at least one processor (par. 0016, lines 3-5); and
 - a flexible operating system executable on the at least one processor to (par. 0015, lines 3-6; par. 0016, lines 3-5):
 - determine whether said operating system is being used as a native operating system(VMM) or as a virtualized operating system(guest software) on said computer system (par. 0031, lines 1-4; par. 0032, lines 1-4); and
 - execute in a first manner as a native operating system on the computer system in response to detecting that said operating system is being used as the native operating system(VMM

Art Unit: 2195

controls interrupt), and execute in a second manner as a virtualized operating system(guest software controls interrupt) on said computer system in response to detecting that said operating system is being used as the virtualized operating system(par. 0031; par. 0033, lines 1-4).

4. As per claim 3, Bennett teaches that operating system executing in said second manner comprises said operating system acting as a paravirtualized operating system (par. 0021).

5. As per claim 4, Bennett teaches that paravirtualized operating system is operable to make a call to a Virtual Machine Monitor (VMM) for performing at least one privileged operation (par. 0020, lines 1-6).

6. As per claim 5, Bennett teaches that operating system determines whether said operating system is being used as the native operating system or the virtualized operating system by: checking a global variable that indicates whether said operating system is being used as the native operating system or as the virtualized operating system on said computer system (par. 0032, lines 1-4; par 0024; lines 1-5; lines 12-14).

7. As per claim 6, Bennett teaches execute an instruction which, when the operating system is being used as the virtualized operating system, causes a Virtual Machine Monitor (VMM) to set at least one configuration bit to a first value and when the operating system is being used as the native operating system, causes the VMM to set said at least one configuration bit to a different value (par. 0023, lines 1-5; par 0024; lines 1-5; lines 12-14).

8. As per claim 7, Bennett teaches set said global variable based at least in part on the value of said at least one configuration bit after executing said instruction (par. 0032, lines 1-4).

9. As per claim 8, Bennett teaches make a call to a Virtual Machine Monitor (VMM) for performing at least one privileged operation(par. 0020, lines 3-5).

10. As per claim 10, Bennett teaches making the call to said VMM is used for performing said at least one privileged operation if determined that said operating system is being used as virtualized operating system on said computer system (par. 0031, lines 6-9; par. 0020, lines 1-6).

11. As per claim 11, Bennett teaches the invention as claimed including a method comprising:

implementing at least one operating system on a computer system(par. 0015, lines 3-6; par. 0016, lines 3-5);

determining, by said computer system, whether said at least one operating system is a native operating system or a guest operating system on a virtual machine(par. 0031, lines 1-4; par. 0032, lines 1-4);

said at least one operating system operating in a first manner if determined that it is a native operating system (par. 0031, lines 1-6); and

said at least one operating system operating in a second manner if determined that it is a guest operating system on a virtual machine (par. 0033, lines 1-4).

12. As per claim 12, Bennett teaches at least one operating system determining whether it is being used as said native operating system or as said guest operating system on the virtual machine (par. 0031, lines 6-9).

13. As per claim 13, it has similar limitations as of claim 5 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational as of claim 5 above.

14. As per claim 14, Bennett teaches the first manner comprises acting as a native operating system (par. 0015, lines 3-6; par. 32, lines 1-4).

15. As per claim 15-16, they have similar limitations as of claims 3 and 4 above. Therefore they are rejected under the same rational as of claims 3 and 4 above.

16. As per claim 17, Bennett teaches the invention as claimed including a computer system:
at least one processor (par. 0016, lines 3-5);
a virtual machine monitor (VMM) (par. 0015, lines 3-6); and
an operating system executable on the least one processor to (par. 0015, lines 3-6; par. 0016, lines 3-5):

determine whether said operating system is running as a virtualized operating system or native operating system (par. 0031, lines 1-4; par. 0032, lines 1-4); and

adapt operation of said operating system depending on whether it is running as the virtualized operating system or native operating system, wherein the native operating system manages hardware resources without using the VMM, and wherein the virtualized operating system manages hardware resources using the VMM (par. 0023, lines 1-5; par 0024; lines 1-5; lines 12-14; par. 0015, lines 3-6; par. 0016, lines 3-5; par. 0019).

17. As per claim 18, it has similar limitations as of claim 5 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational.

18. As per claim 19, Bennett teaches operating system checks said value of said global variable before performing certain privileged operations (par. 0021).

19. As per claim 20, Bennett teaches that operating system performs the determining by determining, before execution of certain privileged instructions, whether said operating system is running as the virtualized operating system or native operating system (par. 0020).

20. As per claim 21 and 22, their combined limitations are similar to limitations of claim 10 above. Therefore they are rejected under the same rational as of claim 10 above.

21. As per claims 23, 24 and 26, they have similar limitations of claims 8, 6 and 7 above. Therefore, they are rejected under the same rational as claims 8, 6 and 7 above.

22. As per claim 25, it has similar limitations of combined limitations of claims 5 and 7 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational as of combined limitations of claims 5 and 7 above.

23. As per claim 27, it is a system claim of claim 17 above. Therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as claim 17 above.

24. As per claims 29-31 and 33, they have similar limitations as of claims 14, 3, 4 and 10 above. Therefore they are rejected under the same rational as of claims 14, 3, 4 and 10 above.

25. As per claim 35, they are method and system claims of claim 1 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational as claim 1 above.

26. As per claim 37, Bennett teaches that means for virtualizing resources of said system and multiplexing said resources among one or more virtualized operating systems par. 0019).

27. As per claim 38, it has similar limitations as of claims 5 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational as of claim 5 above.

28. As per claim 39, Bennett teaches that if determined that it is being used as a virtualized operating system, said flexible operating system acting as a virtualized operating system (par. 0032, lines 1-4; par. 0033, lines 1-4).

29. As per claim 41, Bennett teaches said first manner comprises acting as a native operating system, and wherein said second manner comprises acting as a paravirtualized operating system(par. 0033, lines 1-4; par. 0020).

30. As per claim 42, Bennett teaches the virtualized operating system manages hardware resources of the system by using a virtual machine monitor(VMM), and where the native operating system manages the hardware resources without using the VMM (par. 0015, lines 3-9; par. 0016, lines 3-5; par. 0019).

31. As per claim 43, it has similar limitations as of claims 42 above. Therefore it is rejected under the same rational as of claim 42 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

32. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

33. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al.

(Bennett) US Patent Publication No. 2004/011732, in view of Waldspurger et al.(Waldspurger)

US Patent No. 6725289.

Art Unit: 2195

34. As per claim 9, Bennett teaches making the call to said VMM (par. 0020, 1-6; par 0027).

Bennett does not specifically disclose VMM uses an Application Program Interface (API) defined for said VMM.

However, Waldspurger teaches VMM uses an Application Program Interface (API) defined for said VMM (col 10, lines 24-45)

35. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Waldspurger into the method of Bennett to use application program interface to call VMM. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills of the art would implemented any well known software communication architecture to communicate between guest and VMM which includes using Application Program Interface as a method of communication between application.

36. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. (Bennett) US Patent Publication No. 2004/011732, in view of Fish(Fish) US Patent No. 6199159.

37. As per claim 36, Bennett does not specifically disclose determining means makes the determination during a boot-up process of the system (par. 0024, lines 1-6).

However, Fish teaches determining means makes the determination during a boot-up process of the system (col 2, lines 64-67 through col 3, lines 1-5).

38. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Fish into the method of Bennett to determining during boot-up process. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills of the art utilize the value saved in VMCS in the processor as an identifier to determine the operating mode during boot-up process.

Response to Arguments

39. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim(s) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDULLAH AL KAWSAR whose telephone number is (571)270-3169. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm, EST.

41. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng Ai T. An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

42. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

/Abdullah-Al Kawsar/
Abdullah-Al Kawsar